

REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTION

In response to the Office Action dated October 6, 2004, the claims have not been amended. Claims 2-48 remain in the application. Re-consideration of the application is requested.

II. PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

In paragraph (1) of the Office Action, claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12-17, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26-32, 35, 36, 38, 39, and 41-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Doherty, "Project-specific Web sites," from Interiors, Vol. 157, March 1998 (Doherty) in view of Glasser et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,956,715 (Glasser). In paragraph (2) of the Office Action, claims 4, 18, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Doherty in view of Glasser and further in view of Pajak et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,388,196 (Pajak). In paragraph (3) of the Office Action, claims 5, 8, 19, 22, 34, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Doherty in view of Glasser, and further in view of Kempfer, ActiveProject 3.0, June 1998 (Kempfer). In paragraph (4) of the Office Action, claims 11, 25, 40, and 46-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Doherty in view of Glasser and further in view of what was well known in the art at the time the invention was made.

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Specifically, the independent claims were rejected as follows:

In considering claim 2, Doherty discloses a computer-implemented apparatus comprising:
A computer server (inherent in running a Web site);

An interactive Web site hosted on the computer server ("Web Site"), wherein the interactive Web site is configured to provide access to architectural project information ("project specific Web site" for "construction" projects);

One or more projects including storing, organizing, and displaying a listing of drawings ("CAD") and text files ("specs") in folders ("project directory" and "electronic filing cabinet of documents"), and displaying drawings and text files ("specs, CAD"); and

Project members of the one or more projects ("members of the project teams") including defining access permissions for project members to access to project folders, drawings, and text files ("allowing authorized people access to specific project information").

However, Doherty does not disclose a specific structure of the folders used to store the drawings and text files and an access rights system for such a folder structure. Instead, Doherty only describes a general "project directory" and "electronic filing cabinet" for storing the files, and remains silent regarding a specific structure of the folders. Nonetheless, the use of project folders and standard folders in a project-based networking environment, wherein the project-related administration tasks are accessed from the project-based folders, and project related administration tasks are not available from standard (i.e. general, or public) folders, is well known, as evidenced by Glasser. In a similar art, Glasser discloses a network system for accessing project information on a server, wherein the information is stored in a folder hierarchy, and wherein different users can have

different access permissions to different folders, such as "full access," "limited access," or "read-only access" (col. 7, line 41 – col. 8, line 26, see also, col. 7, lines 5-40 and Fig. 4, describing that some folders are for private projects, such that the project information is available only from those folders). Given this knowledge, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of storing the project information taught by Doherty in a hierarchical folder structure including various access rights to users, as taught by Glasser, because such a folder system allows easy, user-friendly navigation across the web site, and because only members of a project should have access to files stored in a project folder.

Applicants traverse the above rejections for one or more of the following reasons:

- (1) Neither Doherty nor Glasser teach, disclose or suggest an interactive web site configured to display drawings and text files;
- (2) Neither Doherty nor Glasser teach, disclose or suggest project folders and standard folders wherein project related administration tasks are not available for standard folders; and
- (3) Neither Doherty nor Glasser teach, disclose or suggest the ability for a user on web site to have the ability to modify and organize project members, and for the user to define access permissions for such project members to access project folders, standard folders, drawings, and text files.

Independent claims 2, 16, and 31 are generally directed to accessing architectural project information using an interactive web site. As claimed, the web site has various areas (see FIGS. 2-6). Each of the different areas provides the ability to modify and organize particular types of information and functionality. The claims provide that all of the areas must be present. The different areas provide the ability to view and display specific project information and manage who may access the web site and particular projects managed at the web site.

Specifically, one claimed area provides for the modification and organization of site members of the web site (see page 15, line 15-page 16, lines 1; page 24, line 4-page 27, line 8; FIGS. 3, 6, 7, and 11).

Another claimed area provides for the modification and organization of one or more projects including storing, organizing, and displaying a listing drawings and text files in project folders and standard folders (see page 27, line 10-page 30, line 4; page 35, line 5-page 43, line 15; FIGS. 2, 4, 5, and 8). The claimed area also provides for displaying drawing and text files.

A third area provides for the modification and organization of project members of projects. Such an area also provides the ability for the user of the interactive web site to define access permissions for the project members to access project folders, standard folders, drawings, and text

files (see page 27, line 10-page 35, line 4; FIGS. 4, 6, 8, 9, and 10).

Thus, as described in the specification and claimed, a single web site provides explicit functionality that allows the ability to modify and organize project information, users of the web site, and users of a particular project.

In addition, the amended claims provide for specific differences between project folders and standard folders. In this regard, project related administration tasks are available if a user is working with the project folders and are not available when working with the standard folders. Thus, depending on which kind of folders the user is working with, certain tasks may or may not be available. None of the cited references teach or disclose such a distinction.

In rejecting the independent claims, the Office Action relies primarily on Doherty. Firstly, Applicants note that Doherty completely fails to teach a web site that provides for many areas, one of which displays drawings and text files. In rejecting this claim element, the Office Action relies on Doherty "specs, CAD". This portion of Doherty provides:

A project directory: an electronic file cabinet of documents (specs, CAD, product information)...

As can be seen from this text, the "specs, CAD" portion of Doherty merely describes what is in an electronic file cabinet of documents. There is no description, implicit or explicit in Doherty that provides for the display of drawings and text files.

The Office Action then continues and admits that Doherty fails to disclose the specific structure of the folders used to store the drawings and text files and an access rights system for such a folder structure as claimed. In rejecting these claim elements, the Office Action states that it is well known as evidenced by Glasser.

Applicants respectfully traverse such an assertion. Firstly, it is not well known to have a web site with the specific multiple areas set forth in the claims. Further, it is not well known to have a web site with information stored in folders having a specific structure. More specifically, the use of project folders and standard folders where project related administration tasks are not available in standard folders (but are with respect to project folders) and the ability for users of the web site to define access permissions for project members for particular project folders, standard folders, drawings, and text files is not taught, nor suggested, implicitly or explicitly in either Doherty or Glasser.

The claims specifically provide that project related administration tasks are available if the user is working with project folders and are not available when working with standard folders. Glasser simply describes the ability to define different access permissions for different folders. FIG. 4 which is described in col. 7, line 5-col. 8, line 27 merely identifies that a particular folder may have a name "Secret Projects" or "Project X". Further, each of the different folders may have different access permissions. The Office Action states that "some folders are for private projects, such that project information is available only from those folders". Applicants agree with such a statement. However, the present claims do not attempt to claim that certain information (e.g., project information) is only available from project folders. Instead, the claims provide that project administration tasks are only available when working with project folders and not when working with standard folders. In this regard, the Office Action is attempting to merely ignore the terms "project administration tasks" as not having any meaning.

The term "project administration tasks" is used in the specification and is specifically defined. Page 18, line 15-page 20, line 11, and page 27, line 10- page 30, line 4 describes project administration. These pages clearly illustrate tasks that are specific for project related activities. Some of the tasks include adding/removing members and groups to/from a project (or changing their permission level)(and notifying the members of the same), viewing a log of project related activities, change the project name, view the date the project was originally created, its size and URL, view permission set (lock/unlock) status, view total number of files and folders in the project, set the number of file versions that can be saved, specify a project information page URL, specify a project directory URL, archiving project contents, etc.

As claimed, the area of the web site provides the modification and organization of projects wherein certain project administration tasks are only available for certain folders (i.e., project folders). Such an availability of particular tasks based on what type of folder is being accessed/worked with is not even remotely suggested by Doherty or Glasser. In other words, the ability to perform certain tasks is based on which folder is being accessed/worked on. Accordingly, if a user is not working in a particular folder (i.e., a project folder), particular tasks (i.e., project related administration tasks) are not available at all.

Glasser merely allows access levels for different folders to be defined. Such access level settings are not project related administration tasks as claimed. Applicants note that under MPEP

§2142 and 2143.03 “To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). “All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).” In this regard, the term “project related administration tasks” and the meaning behind the term cannot merely be ignored when evaluating the claims. Applicants note that a “task” as set forth in the claims is not merely access to data. The claim language itself states that it is a project related administration task – access to data is not and cannot be interpreted as such a claimed task.

In addition, the other cited references fail to cure the deficiencies of Doherty and Glasser. Also, the various elements of Applicants’ claimed invention together provide operational advantages over the systems disclosed in Doherty, Glasser, Pajak, and Kempfer. Further, Applicants’ invention solves problems not recognized by Doherty, Glasser, Pajak, and Kempfer.

In the prior response, Applicants traversed the rejections of claims 10 and 11. Dependent claim 10 provides that the web site includes an activity log that captures the activities of site member on the web site. Claim 11 provides that the information in claim 10’s activity log can be filtered based on one or more specified properties.

In rejecting claim 10, the final Office Action merely refers to Doherty “logs” of “revisions”. Such language refers to a component of a project specific Web site, namely, that of “online forms and logs (RFIs, revisions, etc.). The present claims provide for an activity log – a specific functionality that records activities of site members on the web site. Accordingly, instead of merely providing a log of revisions to a particular document that may be performed offline and loaded onto a web site, the claims provide detailed limitations regarding the capturing of online activities of site members. Such language is not even remotely alluded to, implicitly or explicitly, by a 5 word description of a log of revisions. In this regard, Applicants note that a revision log may take many forms all of which do not even remotely describe activities of users on a web site. In fact, Applicants submit that a log of revisions does not include site member activity on a web site. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Doherty clearly fails to teach dependent claim 10.

In response to the prior traversal of dependent claim 11, the Office Action admits that neither Doherty nor Glasser disclose filtering the activity. However, the Examiner now takes official notice that filtering a list of items based on specified properties is well known in the

computer arts (i.e., filtering e-mail based on date, sender, subject; filtering files according to type, size; filtering management information according to numerous criteria). The final Office Action then continues and states that it would have been obvious to allow a user or administrator to filter the information contained in the log as taught by Doherty. Firstly, Applicant traverses and disagrees with the Official Notice. Secondly, the filtering of Doherty's log would still fail to teach the claimed invention. In this regard, such filtering would merely filter revisions which does not teach the filtering of web site activities of users/site members.

Applicants also note that the descriptions provided in the Official Notice appear to merely be a manner for sorting e-mail and not for filtering or removing certain items from e-mail. It is known in the art to perform a search for particular items. However, the Official Notice appears to confuse the ability to filter email with sorting or finding particular messages based on specified criteria. Further, the Official Notice relates to email and not to activity logs or logs of any sort. In this regard, Applicants note that filtering email is significantly distinguishable from filtering an activity log for web site activities of a user. Accordingly, Applicants disagree with and traverse both the Official Notice, the teaching that results from the Official Notice, and the rejection of dependent claim 11.

Thus, Applicants submit that independent claims 2, 16, and 31 are allowable over Doherty, Glasser, Pajak, and Kempfer. Further, dependent claims 3-15, 17-20, and 32-45 are submitted to be allowable over Doherty, Glasser, Pajak, and Kempfer in the same manner, because they are dependent on independent claims 2, 16, and 31, respectively, and because they contain all the limitations of the independent claims. In addition, dependent claims 3-15, 17-20, and 32-45 recite additional novel elements not shown by Doherty, Glasser, Pajak, and Kempfer.

III. CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark E. Sweat et al.

By their attorneys,

GATES & COOPER LLP

Howard Hughes Center
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, California 90045
(310) 641-8797

Date: December 6, 2004

By: Jason S. Feldmar
Name: Jason S. Feldmar
Reg. No.: 39,187